

REMARKS

Applicants have studied the Office Action dated July 20, 2007, and have made amendments to the claims. Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been added. It is submitted that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 4 and 12 were objected to because of informalities. In claim 4, "prevents signal transmission *form* the second unit" should be --signal transmission from the second unit--. In claim 12, "the first switching unit prevents signal transmission *form* the first unit" should be --the first switching unit prevents signal transmission from the first unit--.

With this paper, claims 4 and 12 have been amended to correct the word *form* to "from". Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the term "substantially" appearing in claims 1 and 15 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. With this paper, the term "substantially" has been deleted from claims 1 and 15. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 15 overcome the § 112 rejection.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the recitation "the first switching unit transfers any signal transferred from the first unit to the second unit" is considered to be narrative and indefinite by the examiner. With this paper, claim 5 has been amended to recite "the first switching unit prevents signal transmission from the first unit to the second unit". Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 overcomes the § 112 rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,856,594 to Aihara et al. (hereinafter "Aihara"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A proper rejection for anticipation under § 102 requires complete identity of invention. The claimed invention, including each element thereof as recited in the claims, must be

disclosed or embodied, either expressly or inherently, in a single reference. Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech Inc., 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991); Standard Havens Prods., Inc. v. Gencor Indus., Inc., 953 F.2d 1360, 1369, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The invention defined by amended claim 1 is a router apparatus wherein routing information of a first unit is mirrored to a second unit in real time, and wherein the mirrored routing information is transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit.

A similar routing apparatus, including all of the elements recited in claim 1, is not identically disclosed in Aihara. There is no disclosure in Aihara of a combination including transferring the mirrored routing information from the first unit to the second unit along one path. Aihara discloses simultaneously transmitting duplicated cells from a Node C to a Node F on both a working channel and a protection channel (FIGS. 1 and 2 of Aihara). However, Aihara does not teach transferring routing information along one path, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the claim 1, and the claims dependent from claim 1, are allowable over Aihara.

Claims 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The invention defined by amended claim 16 is a data redundancy system comprising a first unit comprising a first memory for storing routing information, the first unit simultaneously transferring the routing information to a second unit while storing the routing information in the first memory. Moreover, the routing information is transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit.

A similar system, including all of the elements recited in claims 16, is not identically disclosed in AAPA. There is no disclosure in AAPA of simultaneously transferring the routing information from the first unit to the second unit. Rather, AAPA discloses that a certain time delay occurs when memory data is transferred from an active board to a standby board (paragraph 0010 of AAPA; FIG. 1). Moreover, AAPA discloses that because communication between the active board and the standby board is made through PCI-to-PCI bridges, real time mirroring is not possibly implemented (paragraph 0011). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 16, and the claims dependent from claim 16, are allowable over AAPA.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5, 10-12, 15-20, 25-27 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,487,169 to Tada (hereinafter "Tada"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, amended claim 1 is allowable over Aihara. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Tada fails to cure the deficiencies of Aihara with respect to the mirrored routing information being transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit, as recited in claim 1. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 3-5, which are dependent on claim 1, are also allowable over the cited references.

The invention defined by amended claim 10 is a routing redundancy apparatus comprising a first unit for storing routing information in a first memory and for simultaneously transferring the routing information to a second unit, wherein the routing information is transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit.

A similar apparatus, including all of the elements recited in claim 10, is not disclosed in Aihara. There is no disclosure in Aihara of a combination including transferring the routing information from the first unit to the second unit along one path. Aihara discloses simultaneously transmitting duplicated cells from a Node C to a Node F on both a working channel and a protection channel (FIGS. 1 and 2 of Aihara). However, Aihara does not teach transferring routing information along one path, as recited in claim 10.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Tada fails to cure the deficiencies of Aihara with respect to the routing information being transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit, as recited in claim 10. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 11, 12 and 15, which are dependent on claim 10, are also allowable over the cited references.

The invention defined by amended claim 16 is a data redundancy system comprising a first unit for comprising a first memory for storing routing information, the first unit simultaneously transferring the routing information to a second unit while storing the routing information in the first memory, wherein the routing information is transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit.

A similar system, including all of the elements recited in claim 16, is not disclosed in Aihara. There is no disclosure in Aihara of a combination including transferring the routing

information from the first unit to the second unit along one path. Aihara discloses simultaneously transmitting duplicated cells from a Node C to a Node F on both a working channel and a protection channel (FIGS. 1 and 2 of Aihara). However, Aihara does not teach transferring routing information along one path, as recited in claim 16.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Tada fails to cure the deficiencies of Aihara with respect to the routing information being transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit, as recited in claim 16. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 17-20, which are dependent on claim 16, are also allowable over the cited references.

The invention defined by amended claim 25 is a method of providing data redundancy in a routing system comprising transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit via a first switching unit in communication with a second unit, wherein the routing information is transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit.

A similar method, including all of the elements recited in claim 25, is not disclosed in Aihara. There is no disclosure in Aihara of a combination including transferring the routing information from the first unit to the second unit along one path. Aihara discloses simultaneously transmitting duplicated cells from a Node C to a Node F on both a working channel and a protection channel (FIGS. 1 and 2 of Aihara). However, Aihara does not teach transferring routing information along one path, as recited in claim 25.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Tada fails to cure the deficiencies of Aihara with respect to the routing information being transferred along one path from the first unit to the second unit, as recited in claim 25. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 26, 27 and 29, which are dependent on claim 25, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 6 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Tada, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,493,593 to Kamiya et al. (hereinafter "Kamiya"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that Kamiya fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Aihara and Tada with respect to transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit along one path, as recited in claims 1 and 10. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the combination of Aihara, Tada

and Kamiya. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 6 and 13, which respectively depend on claims 1 and 10, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,005,841 to Kicklighter (hereinafter "Kicklighter"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, claim 1 is allowable over Aihara. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that Kicklighter fails to cure the deficiencies of Aihara with respect to transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit along one path, as recited in claim 1. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Kicklighter. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, is also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Tada, and further in view of Kicklighter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that Kicklighter fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Aihara and Tada with respect to transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit along one path, as recited in claim 1. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Aihara, Tada and Kicklighter. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 8 and 9, which are dependent on claim 1, are also allowable over the cited references.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Tada, and further in view of Kicklighter. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, claim 10 is allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that Kicklighter fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Aihara and Tada with respect to transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit along one path, as recited in claim 10. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 10 is allowable over the combination of Aihara, Tada and Kicklighter. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 14, which is dependent on claim 10, is also allowable over the cited references.

Claims 21-24, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Tada, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,182,801 to Asfour (hereinafter "Asfour"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As previously asserted, claims 16 and 25 are allowable over the combination of Aihara and Tada. Furthermore, it is respectfully asserted that Asfour fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Aihara and Tada with respect to transferring routing information from a first unit to a second unit along one path, as recited in claims 16 and 25. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 25 are allowable over the combination of Aihara, Tada and Asfour. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 21-24, which depend on claim 16, and claims 28 and 30, which depend on claim 25, are also allowable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the present application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: October 22, 2007
By: _____

Craig W. Schmoyer
Registration No. 51,007
Attorney(s) for Applicant(s)

Customer No. 035884